



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,850	08/16/2000	Toshihiro Endo	0250-814	2448

22204 7590 12/17/2001

NIXON PEABODY, LLP
8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE
SUITE 800
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

CRENSHAW, MARVIN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2854

14

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/639,850

Applicant(s)

ENDO ET AL.

Examiner

Marvin P. Crenshaw

Art Unit

2854

-- *Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with th correspondence address --*
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the diaphragm" in describing an ink supply pump. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al. and in view of Miller et al.

Black teaches a stencil printer comprising an ink supply pump in the form of a diaphragm pump. However, Black et al. doesn't teach the use of silicone rubber.

Miller teaches a diaphragm pump which is made of silicone rubber. Miller et al. has it that silicone rubber is known to have a swelling ratio to the ink of less than 1.05. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the diaphragm pump

of Black et al. with silicone rubber as taught by Miller et al. to prevent from deteriorating after time.

Regarding claim 1, the phrase "adapted" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

The functional recitations set forth in the claims, for example claim 2, lines 2-4; claim 3, lines 2-4 have not been given patentable weight because they are narrative in form. In order to be given patentable weight, a functional recitation must be supported by sufficient positively recited claim structure to warrant the presence of the functional language. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to design the diaphragm pump to work at a maximum limit to prevent it from deteriorating.

Claim 5 and 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al. and in view of Miller et al. as applied to claims 1-4 and 6 above, and further in view of Kawahata et al.

Black et al. as modified by Miller et al. teaches all the limitations of claims 1-4 and 6 except for using ultraviolet ray curing ink. Kawahata et al. teaches using ultraviolet ray curing ink (col. 6, line 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the stencil apparatus of Black et al. with ultraviolet ray curing ink as taught by Kawahata et al. in order to have the ink to dry faster.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marvin P. Crenshaw whose telephone number is (703)308-0797. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and every other Friday 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hilten can be reached on (703)308-0719. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

MPC

December 13, 2001



JOHN S. HILTEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800